



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,219	07/27/2001	Yury Shapiro	07066-065001	6829

7590 08/26/2003

Beyer, Weaver & Thomas, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

MERLINO, AMANDA H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2877

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/916,219

Applicant(s)

SHAPIRO ET AL.

Examiner

Amanda H Merlino

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6 & 9 6) ☐ Other: _____

Drawings

Figures 1-4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1, 5, 14, 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Harmer (4,682,889)

Harmer teaches of a fingerprint detecting device comprising an optical plate (12) made of material with a refraction index of 1.412, a light source (30) and a sensor positioned to receive light collected from the finger.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2877

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harmer (4,682,889)

Harmer teaches of a fingerprint detecting device comprising an optical plate (12) made of material with a refraction index of 1.412, a light source (30) and a sensor positioned to receive light collected from the finger.

Harmer lacks the teaching of the optical plate material being silicone or TPX or Butyrate.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace silicone with either silicone or TPX or Butyrate since all have indices of refraction less than 1.44 and since applicant has not disclosed that use of silicone or TPX or Butyrate solves any stated problem, has any specific benefit, or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well as a functional equivalent with Sylgard. Furthermore Harmer states that other resilient materials other than Sylgard may be used.

Claims 6-13 and 19-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ivanisov et al (WO 01/18741) in view of Harmer (4,682,889).

Ivanisov et al teach of a thin prism fingerprint imager system comprising a prism with a first surface for receiving a finger, a second surface for a light source, a third surface having a reflective surface (240) and a fourth surface for the imaging system.

Art Unit: 2877

Ivanisov lacks the teaching of the prism being made out of a material with an index of refraction less than 1.49.

Harmer teaches of a prism in a fingerprint detecting device having a refractive index of 1.412.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the prism in the apparatus taught by Ivanisov with the prism having an index of refraction of 1.412 to provide a more pliable prism which "provide wider ridges which allow a better discrimination of details" as taught by Harmer.

With reference to claims 19-20, the method of forming an optical plate, the claims appear to contain no patentable steps in manufacturing an optical plate, however if applicant believes that the method steps are novel, examiner will consider examining the claims after an election in reply to a restriction.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 10/28/02 and 6/3/03 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609(B)(2)(i). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2877

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Maase et al (5,528,355) and Sarto (6,175,407) and Suga(6,115,483) teach of fingerprinting devices wherein the optical plate contains material with a refractive index less than 1.44.

Papers related to the application may be submitted to Group 2800 by Fax transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 2800 via the PTO Fax Machine located in Crystal Plaza 4. The form of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CP4 Fax Machine number is:

703-308-7722

If the applicant wishes to send a Fax dealing with a Proposed Amendment for discussion for a phone interview then the fax should:


- 1) Contain either the statement "DRAFT" or "PROPOSED AMENDMENT" on the Fax Cover Sheet; and
- 2) Should be unsigned by the attorney or agent.

This will ensure that it will not be entered into the case and will be forwarded to the examiner as quickly as possible.

Art Unit: 2877

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Examiner Amanda H. Merlino* whose telephone number is (703) 305-3488. The examiner can be reached on Mondays and Thursdays only.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0956.

Amanda H. Merlino 
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2877
August 21, 2003/ahm



FRANK G. FONT
SUPERVISORY PATENT
EXAMINER